When visitors enter the National Museum of the United States Navy’s Cold War Gallery located at the Washington Navy Yard, a submarine-launched Trident C-4 missile poised overhead makes a striking first impression. Off to the left, the sail of a Sturgeon-class nuclear submarine seems to be diving into the floor, causes a second gasp of surprise.

With the completion of these initial Cold War gallery exhibits, there is enough critical mass to offer visitors the opportunity to tour this historic building at the Washington Navy Yard that once hosted the Navy’s Experimental Model Basin and first wind tunnel.

With its research and development lineage well-established, it is appropriate that this building, featuring new exhibits detailing the history and the role science played in the Cold War, can serve as an inspirational source for future generations interested in technology.

During the Summer of 2011, eight high school science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) teachers traveled to the nation’s capital to examine the new exhibits with the idea of exploiting the technology of the Cold War for use in the nation’s classrooms. Their odyssey, underwritten by the Naval Historical Foundation (NHF), came about following a meeting between NHF Board Director Dr. Barbara Pilling, a former educator in the Fairfax County (Virginia) school system, and the Navy Museum’s education staff. Pilling observed: “Who best to determine the needs of our schools than the lynchpin of our education system teachers!” Thus the NHF established a Teacher Fellowship program. Several dozen talented teachers from around the nation applied.

Working in teams of four, the selected teacher fellows successfully used the displays and artifacts in the gallery’s new Covert Submarine Operations Exhibit to create innovative STEM lesson plans. From a broad range of possible submarine-related topics tied to common core and state STEM educational standards, the first fellowship teacher team was intrigued by ballistic missiles. Passing by the technologies inherent in sonars, periscopes, torpedoes, cruise missiles, fire control systems, nuclear reactors, communications, or ship control systems, this group chose to link ballistic missiles to biology, geometry, algebra, and STEM standards. In biology, types of ballistic missiles (and submarines) provided an outstanding illustration of a use for the dichotomous key, which is normally used for species identification. A biology example of shark-identification with a dichotomous key was used for contrast and comparison.

Hands-on activities for algebra and geometry included construction of an actual-size inflatable D5 Trident II missile with painter’s plastic, tape, and a fan. Combining historical videos of missile launches with calculations of Polaris, Poseidon, Trident I, and Trident II missile volumes and surface areas and graphical analysis of volume, weight,
If you’re a public historian following the current discussion within the academic community about the need to train history graduate students for careers outside university settings, you might be excused for thinking it has an oddly Rip Van Winkle quality to it all.

An article by the distinguished historian Thomas Bender published on February 12, 2012, in the Chronicle of Higher Education caught my eye (“What’s Been Lost in History”). Bender’s reflections on how the profession has changed in his 40-plus year career are a welcome addition to what has heretofore been an anemic dialogue within the academy. Bender’s essay was prompted by an October 2011 admonition by then-American Historical Association president Anthony Grafton and AHA executive director Jim Grossman to history departments to consider ways to cultivate multi-track careers for graduate students (appearing in the AHA’s Perspectives on History under the title “No More Plan B: A Very Modest Proposal for Graduate Programs in History”).

Bender’s observations are most prescient when he reminds us that in the early years of our profession the training of Ph.D.s was linked to the need to prepare individuals for lives of civic engagement. Which is why the deans of our profession—the Herbert Baxter Adams and Frederick Jackson Turners—structured the study of history and the education programs which followed in broad “civic terms, our profession—the Herbert Baxter Adams and Frederick Jackson Turners—structured the study of history and the education programs which followed in broad “civic terms, not in narrowly academic or disciplinary ones. [Graduate schools] proposed to educate civic leaders.” Bender rightly notes that in the late nineteenth century, “the connection between history and civic life, between history and the schools and the university, was well understood” by the modern founders of our profession.

And yet, welcome as such observations are, they also demonstrate just how out of touch academic departments have been—and continue to be—in designing curricula and offering training that prepares students to use their degrees productively in both the marketplace and wider society. Bender’s article encourages academic departments “to consider nonacademic as well as academic careers as proper outcomes of doctoral education.” It’s quite simply an admission that as jobs within the academy have shrunk for nearly half a century “we must acknowledge a new normal.” This, we all know, is old news. We also know that the market continues to drive young historians to public history even if their academic advisers don’t point them in our direction.

Academic departments have been slow to accept the “new normal,” and I’m unsure that we can reasonably expect that they will change their habits anytime soon. Many of academia’s problems are self-inflicted. In this regard, I often point to my Ph.D. program at the University of Maryland’s history department. For decades this program churned out a host of individuals who’ve led productive and rewarding careers as historians in the federal government. But the department has always been a place where “Plan A” was to use your degree to teach in the university. Remarkably, the department has done little to suggest to new students that there are alternatives to “Plan A,” much less to showcase its considerable cast of alums in the public history field. Compounding the problem, Maryland, like so many other academic departments, has marginalized political and foreign affairs history over the last two decades. retirements in these fields occurred and the vacancies were never filled. Today, were I or other of my colleagues who now hold leading public history jobs starting our careers and considering Maryland as a place to seek degrees focusing on these areas, we would have to conclude that the department no longer would be an option for us. Maryland is far from unique in this aspect.
While the academics have slept, a thriving public history field has sprung up outside the academy. Here are some of the highlights. In 1979, the National Council on Public History was founded “to inform the public about the value, uses, and pleasures of history” as well as “to help students prepare for careers in public history”; the NCPH’s journal The Public Historian, with its roots at the University of California at Santa Barbara, started earlier. Our Society was also founded in 1979 to promote history within the federal government. Our organizations count hundreds of individuals practicing diverse public history methods across a range of employing agencies and disciplinary sub-fields. In working with the Organization of American Historians Committee on Public History, I can safely argue that the fastest growing segment of that organization’s membership since 2000 has been in the non-academic (by which the OAH means non-four-year university) field. I suspect the AHA trends are the same.

And yet, Bender’s article—which seems to me fairly representative of academic disengagement with public historians—fails even to use the phrase “public history.” While Bender admits the need to think more broadly, his solutions are inward looking, asking academicians to re-double their efforts when they have forgotten their aim. In calling for a richer curriculum for both undergraduate and graduate students he notes, “That will require working with colleagues in other departments and schools of universities to challenge the fear of change and establish new tracks and new majors.” Nary a thought of engaging the thriving network of historians who have been outside the academy!

We in public history have a unique opportunity—in deed, a responsibility—to reach out to graduate students in the humanities. Our field, and particularly our brand of it as federal historians, archivists, and curators, holds great appeal. It offers a rewarding combination of research, publishing, and public-interaction opportunities. It also offers a living wage and benefits which today frequently seem to elude more and more folks on academic tracks—especially those forced to cobble together adjunct positions or those climbing the steep tenure-track ladder.

SHFG has made some strides in recent years, reaching out to graduate students and new professionals. This isn’t just necessary for the vitality of the Society—it is part of our duty to give back to public history. Our revitalized web site reaches younger historians. Our annual conferences draw a mix of both public and academic historians. SHFG members also have sponsored and organized many jobs panels at the major conferences that often filling the room with job seekers. With the enrollment of each new SHFG member, I write a welcome letter and I’m pleased to report that over the last year many of these newcomers have been graduate students or newly hired federal public historians stationed outside of Washington, D.C.

That is heartening. But we can do more! That is why I have proposed that the Society sponsor an annual day-long skills workshop centered on federal records research that would appeal to both graduate students and young professionals. We have such a pool of experience and talent in our organization, and it is only natural that we should engage academics by sharing that knowledge. We will begin modestly, initiating a workshop program this year seeking to draw perhaps two dozen individuals. The workshop would be capped by a reception with ample opportunity for SHFG members to mingle and help others build professional networks. Down the road, I suspect there will be greater opportunities to develop partnerships with local universities and history programs, as well as those outside Washington.

New facts must lead us to revisit and reconsider old assumptions, the pragmatic commentator Walter Lippmann once wrote. This truism is central to the historian’s craft. And yet the academic departments from which many of us hail have been slow to react to new realities and adjust accordingly. We in federal public history have a special part to play in probing the conversation—joined belatedly by our academic cousins—along more fruitful channels.

Matt Wasniewski
President

CALL FOR PAPERS

Federal History, the journal of the Society for History in the Federal Government, seeks articles for its 2013 issue. Federal History features scholarship on the history of the federal government, including military history, 1776–present. We welcome manuscripts from federal historians and others working in the federal government, as well as independent scholars and historians working in public history and academia. See http://shfg.org/shfg/publications/federal-history-journal/ for current issue, past issues, and details on submissions, which should be sent to editor-shfg-journal@shfg.org.
and range relationships, students can learn about each generation of ballistic missile by calculating and graphing size and range improvements during the Cold War. Another student teamwork project envisions designing a “missile” using paper, plastic straws, rubber bands, paper clips, glue pen, balloons, craft sticks, tape, graph paper, ruler, and scissors. After trial-and-error flight testing, each team would then sketch a final design in computer 3-D or on graph paper, conduct a peer evaluation on teamwork, and write a reflective essay on the engineering process. A follow-up activity would include creating a 3-D drawing of an actual missile, then building a scale model of the missile.

The second team of four STEM Fellows also focused on several missile-related topics in statistics and chemistry: the Cold War build-up of submarine ballistic missile warheads, warhead reduction due to strategic arms treaties, and atomic structure/isotopes in nuclear materials.

However, the uploading of the lesson plans on a new website has not served as a reason to declare victory. One of the stipulations for the fellowship program is that the teachers present their work at regional and national conferences. “We note an uptick in visits to the web site following each teacher conference presentation,” observes NHF webmaster Dave Colamaria. Meanwhile, the Naval Education and Training Command is evaluating the lesson plans for incorporation into NJROTC curriculum used in numerous schools across the country.

In a self-evaluation of the resultant product, the NHF recognized that with little effort, much historical context could be injected into the STEM lesson plans. “The history of the Navy is a history of technology,” notes NHF Board Director Rear Admiral Richard Gentz. Thus for the 2012 “STEM-[H]” Teacher Fellowship program, the NHF will also invite history teachers to round out each team. Program information and application data has been posted at www.navyhistory.org.

With this slight tweak of the program, the 12 teachers arriving in the Summer of 2012 should have the opportunity to work in a new science, technology, engineering, mathematics and history STEM-[H] Education Center that will be installed to support this and other outreach initiatives.

One of those other initiatives, Mission Ocean™, was developed in 1997 by a team at Purdue University Calumet. It is based on deep-sea submarine research and rescue simulation and is an inquiry-based, hands-on learning experience related to submarine operations. School districts in California, Indiana, Ohio, and Kentucky that have implemented the Mission Ocean curriculum have demonstrated improvements not only in Science and Math test scores, but also in English and verbal communications. Many of the activities incorporate teamwork as a major element using four modules: Getting Underway Team, Drive Team, Dive Team, and Navigation Team.

NHF is working with Purdue University-Calumet and Naval Sea Systems Command to install a 12-computer Mission Ocean simulation network in the planned STEM-[H] Education Center located in the Cold War Gallery. The combined computer outputs of the Mission Ocean modules is projected in 3D on a large screen to conduct, observe and evaluate the overall conduct of the mission. This year, four schools in Prince William County, Virginia (two grade schools and two middle schools) are piloting the use of the Mission Ocean curriculum within their schools. Plans call for them to conduct their graduation missions at the Washington Navy Yard in Spring 2012 once the STEM-[H] Education Center is added to the museum.

Another component of the STEM-[H] Education Center will be Exploration Command Consoles (ECCs). ECCs are shore site installations that display the live streaming video feeds, audio communications, and data feeds from undersea research ships at sea, including vessels from Dr. Robert Ballard’s Institute for Exploration. The ECC planned for installation as part of the STEM-[H] Education Center could be used by students as part of Navy History and Heritage Command educational outreach through the Command’s Underwater Archaeology staff, as well as by dedicated interns and researchers. An ECC focusing on cutting-edge undersea technology, engineering, and exploration will increase public education initiatives, and is a complementary component to the elementary and middle school Mission Ocean™ program and STEM-[H] Teacher Fellowship Program.

The combination of hands-on undersea operations and research simulations, actual at-sea explorations and research missions, and expanded STEM-[H] lesson planning by expert teachers, using world-wide internet outreach, will provide an expanded educational focus for the National Museum of the United States Navy.

David F. Winkler is a historian with the Naval Historical Foundation in Washington, DC. He thanks Capt. John Paulson, USN (Ret.), a retired science teacher with the Prince William County (Virginia) school system, who coordinated the activities of the teacher fellows, for contributing to this article.
THE COLD WAR GALLERY

The Cold War Gallery project is a long-term Navy-Naval Historical Foundation initiative on behalf of the National Navy Museum at the Washington Navy Yard that has been over a decade in the making. Working with Design & Production (D&P) Inc. of Lorton, Va., the Navy-Naval Historical Foundation team designed the exhibits to tell the Navy’s role in the Cold War. The gallery is housed in the historic David Taylor Model Basin Building along the Anacostia waterfront. With funding support from generous individual and corporate donors, the Naval Historical Foundation has contracted with D&P to install a series of exhibits starting with a central interpretive hall featuring a C-4 Trident submarine-launched ballistic missile and aircraft carrier Ready Room Theater. Last summer, the Covert Submarine Operations in the Cold War exhibit was completed. This summer, an exhibit titled “Into the Lion’s Den” will cover naval gunfire support in Vietnam. After that, further exhibit building will be put on hold as the Navy considers options to move exhibits within its the main museum and the adjacent Cold War Gallery to another location. A virtual tour of completed and exhibits yet to be installed can be found at www.usnavymuseum.org.

SPRING 2012 Cold War Gallery STEM-[H] Exhibit Fabrication and Installation

The following components from the master exhibit plan for the Cold War Gallery have been selected for fabrication and installation in the North Hall of the Cold War Gallery to stimulate STEM-[H] lesson plan development for STEM-[H] Teacher Fellows arriving during the Summer of 2012. Those components are:

**Maritime Strategy:** “An era of violent peace,” building the fleet through construction and modernization. Ships weapons are modernized for defense (Tartar, Terrier missiles) and offense (Harpoon, Tomahawk missiles), along with radars and fire control systems, keeping ships like USS New Jersey (BB 62) and her three Iowa-class sister ships, in operation. The exhibit includes scale models of Phalanx Close In Weapon System and the modernized USS New Jersey.

**AEGIS:** battle management system, “shield of Zeus” protection from aircraft, missiles, ships, and submarines by integrating improved phased-array radar, improved sonar, computerized fire control and weapon systems for 100+ target capability. This exhibit design includes graphics of the SPY 1-A radar and USS Ticonderoga, a biography of RADM Wayne E. Meyer, a functional diagram of the AEGIS system, and an AEGIS CIC mural with an embedded 32” audiovisual display. The 3-5 minute video will explain the AEGIS system.

**Missile R&D:** surface-to-air, air-to-air, surface-to-surface, land attack missile development. Full scale missiles on display: Tartar, Phoenix, Harpoon, Tomahawk, with display graphics describing each missile.

**Soviet Navy:** Rise of the Soviet submarine force, and a more balanced surface fleet after the Cuban missile crisis. The display includes comparison of fleets, aircraft, missiles, and warheads to provide a contrast to the U.S. Navy and rationale for our fleet build-up.

**Cold War Build-Up of the Fleet:** “In response to the Communist threat, the U.S. built a powerful fleet of aircraft carriers, deploying jet aircraft, combat-ready amphibious forces, and submarines and surface warships armed with conventional and nuclear weapons.” Displays include an ADM Arleigh Burke biography and artifacts, an AEGIS destroyer model, and modern sailor skills/ ratings descriptions. The exhibit also includes a 32” audiovisual display with a 3-5 minute video describing the surface fleet in action, including ship types, ship-building, and replenishment at sea.
SHFG committee members are sometimes asked to take on additional special assignments related to the work of a committee. An example of such special duty is documented in the records that Dr. Terrence J. “Terry” Gough recently provided to the SHFG Archives.

From 1980 to 1994, Gough was a member of the SHFG Archives Committee, renamed the Archives and Information Management Committee. He also chaired the committee in 1987 and 1988. As both a private researcher and as a historian with the Center of Military History, he used records at the National Archives extensively, and from his interaction with archivists understood the problems and challenges the agency faced. The period of Gough’s membership on the Archives Committee was a particularly active one for the National Archives, including Federal budget reductions, GSA oversight and interference, the Archives’ “independence movement,” appraisal and access controversies, and planning for a new archival facility.

It was in connection with planning for the National Archives at College Park, soon known as Archives II, that Gough took on an additional duty for the SHFG. Archivist of the United States Don W. Wilson had asked SHFG President Marty Reuss to suggest a local SHFG member to serve on a group of outside users to consult with NARA on the researcher services for the new building project, and Reuss nominated Gough, although in a handwritten note in the files, Reuss states that Wilson had specifically asked for Gough. In any case, in a letter dated December 20, 1988, Wilson formally asked Gough to participate. He replied in the affirmative January 3, 1989, noting that “As you know, the Society is committed to working with NARA toward our common goal of facilitating NARA’s mission to preserve and make available the records of our government. The development of Archives II and the impact of the development process on the user community are prime areas of Society interest.” Wilson responded on January 12, expressing his appreciation to Gough, and stating that the initial meeting would be held on January 16. Called the Archives II Users Advisory Group, often shortened to Users Group, it included representatives of other institutions or organizations, including the American Historical Association, Organization of American Historians, Society of American Archivists, and genealogists. Over the next three years, the Users Group would meet with NARA representatives, attend NARA presentations on Archives II, as well as meet amongst themselves, and provide information to and solicit opinions from their constituents. In a notice published in the Fall 1989 issue of The Federalist, Gough summarized its activities and intent.

The Users Group’s discussions have covered a variety of design features, including layout of the research complex, custodial unit offices, and stacks; interior environment (especially lighting and noise levels); use of compact shelving; security standards; and parking. Other issues covered include provision of archival assistance; division of records between the present main building and Archives II; means of moving records within the new building; location of finding aids; and researcher orientation. In advising Archivist Don Wilson and his staff, the Users Group has emphasized that the building should facilitate the close interaction between archivists and users that is essential to successful research.

The Users Group met eight times in 1989, then less frequently in 1990, 1991, and 1992. Its last meeting appears to have been in December 1992, although it may have continued to play a role even after the opening of Archives II in 1994. While not always happy with the final decisions, the Archives II Users Advisory Group made sure that NARA officials were aware of the concerns of those whom they represented. By his participation in the Users Group, Gough not only served the SHFG, but enabled the Society to further its mission of assisting and supporting the use and understanding of Federal history. For further information on the SHFG Archives, e-mail chasdowns@verizon.net
In mid-2010, the Department of State Office of the Historian (HO) began a major initiative to research the history of the *Foreign Relations of the United States* series (*FRUS*) to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the inaugural *FRUS* volume, published in 1861. Although the work is ongoing, we have made a concerted effort to share the results of our research on an interim basis. See [http://history.state.gov/frus150](http://history.state.gov/frus150) for an array of short articles, scholarly panels, and public sessions we have presented to date. We envision, ultimately, producing a book-length study that will provide a definitive history of *FRUS* from its origins to the present day. This article outlines how HO built a research/dissemination team and how we have pursued a multifaceted research agenda.

As with all federal history programs, securing the human resources to conduct research was the principal issue. A combination of good fortune and good timing, plus, of course, supportive senior management, enabled the HO to undertake this significant initiative. Like many of our staff, Aaron Marrs pursues personal historical research on his own time. He became sufficiently interested in the early years of *FRUS* that he began independently examining the origins of the inaugural volume. Aaron’s research specialty is mid-19th-century American history, so his expertise dovetailed nicely with the period of *FRUS*’s origins. When I began a serious discussion within HO about how we could staff a major research effort, I discovered that Aaron was already underway. I then discussed with his division chief whether it might be possible to utilize some of Aaron’s “on the clock” time as well, and we worked out an arrangement enabling him to contribute to the Sesquicentennial research initiative without significant prejudice to his “regular” duties.

Peter Cozzens came to HO at exactly the right time. As a veteran Foreign Service officer exercising his option to select an office of his choice for special duty, his services are “free” to HO; we do not have to commit one of our regular positions to benefit from his contributions. Peter is a prizewinning author of historical works covering the Civil War and the later 19th century, all written on his own time. Because most of the historians we hire specialize in the Cold War period of American diplomatic history, Peter’s expertise was precisely what we needed to explore the post-bellum history of *FRUS*. Joshua Botts joined the Special Projects division just as the *FRUS* Sesquicentennial project got underway, and his specialization in later 20th-century U.S. history fit nicely with our needs. Since Josh works for the Special Projects division, I assigned him to explore the very intricate story of *FRUS* as it grew in size and stature over the last 100 years. As our work developed, we drew upon our in-house web site experts, other members of HO staff, several talented interns, and many archivists to conduct research, disseminate our findings, and develop ways to engage the larger issues in American history and governmental practice raised by a careful study of *FRUS*.

The research itself has been conducted in a wide array of sources. The National Archives, of course, is the paramount venue for researching topics of this kind. State Department records yielded a variety of documents, including various iterations of the central files, post files, lot (office) files, and some quite obscure miscellaneous holdings. We have suffered disappointments, such as discovering that Government Printing Office records, documenting an agency which also began operations in 1861, provide no clues about how many copies of the early *FRUS* volumes were actually published. There is a rich stream of information about “pre-*FRUS*” releases to Congress in the decades preceding the Civil War that we have yet to fully digest. Those records appear to demonstrate that the give-and-take between congressional requests for information...
and executive responses dates back to the founding of the republic. For this early period we have examined published primary documentary collections as well, such as the Lincoln Papers and the U.S. Serial Set. Our work has also relied on standard legislative sources such as the Congressional Record and predecessors such as the Congressional Globe. We have mined the congressional serial sets to find scores of congressional executive documents that functioned as supplemental FRUS volumes. The State Department’s Ralph Bunche Library (the oldest library in the Federal System, inaugurated by Thomas Jefferson) holds copies of certain hard-to-find items, such as late-19th-century supplementary FRUS volumes. Records still retained by the Department of State have proven essential to understanding the past several decades. We have negotiated with the Department’s Office of Information Programs and Services to secure the declassification of select tranches of documents, including the minutes of the first Historical Advisory Committee meeting in 1957 (later mandated by Congress to advise HO on FRUS-related matters) and certain records from the 1980s relating to controversies that resulted in FRUS’s current legislative mandate (22 U.S.C. 4351 et seq., enacted in 1991).

Our researchers have also consulted a number of manuscript collections. At the Library of Congress this includes important personages from the 19th century, largely forgotten today, such as John Bassett Moore, Hamilton Fish, Thomas Bayard, and J. C. Bancroft Davis. Eisenhower Library personnel copied and forwarded material from the Dulles Papers, and University of Vermont staff provided documents from the revealing collection of diplomat and environmentalist George P. Marsh. While HO staff member Evan Dawley was on leave teaching at Reed College in Portland Oregon, we learned that the papers of former office director George Bernard Noble located there held important information for the story of FRUS in the 1950s. Moreover, another important staff member from that time, Bryton Barron, had deposited his papers at the University of Oregon in Eugene. We took advantage of this fortuitous circumstance to have our own temporarily resident expert conduct research in these faraway collections that we could otherwise not have afforded to consult.

Additionally, we have accessed hundreds of historical newspapers, some of longstanding stature such as the New York Times and the New Orleans Times-Picayune, important chronicles of bygone days including the Chicago Inter Ocean and the New York Herald, and long-forgotten local sources such as the Bangor Whig and Courier. And finally, of course, we have examined, in great detail, the documents printed in the FRUS volumes themselves. Knowing how the volumes were created only adds to the pleasure of reading this remarkably informative record of America in the world.

It will come as no surprise that our research has taken unexpected directions. We started out thinking we knew certain things about the series, only to discover we were wrong about many of them. For example, the modicum of existing literature treats the first FRUS volume as a radical departure, a new exemplar of openness in time of war. In fact, FRUS emerged out of longstanding practice; differences over the key issue of transparency-versus-secrecy date back to the 1790s. We also thought the 19th-century FRUS was compiled by amateur clerks, but in fact it appears that core members of the Department operated as proto-professionals, demonstrating a high degree of expertise and judgment. We have also been surprised to discover how many times in the 20th century the series engendered controversy and dispute; as the United States grew into a world power, the dilemmas attendant to releasing sensitive documentation have become increasingly difficult to resolve. We also began with a series of questions in mind, some of which we have not answered to our satisfaction. We still do not know enough about why the series began to lag from contemporaneous publication in the first decades of the 20th century. We have been unable to determine the actual number of volume copies published and to whom they were distributed before the later 20th century. Accounting for events since 1980, especially the issues addressed by the Historical Advisory Committee, will require oral history interviews. Moreover, new questions have arisen in the course of our research, many as interesting as those with which we began. Who were the “clerks” who compiled 19th-century volumes? Has the series ever fallen prey to manipulation for political purposes? Does the publishing of foreign policy documents negatively affect current reporting from the field? How do other nations view the revelations emerging from FRUS volumes?

Finally, our research has had an immediate impact we had not anticipated. Office of the Historian staff and Historical Advisory Committee members have come to a deeper understanding of our current and future challenges based on historical perspectives yielded by the sesquicentennial research. We also have a better sense of how the importance of the series has changed over time. In the 19th century, FRUS was essential to the daily work of the Department and served as an important tool for both public relations and public diplomacy. At present, FRUS represents a world-renowned symbol of openness in government through the responsible release of sensitive documents. Most importantly, we are better able to explain to professional and general audiences how FRUS highlights important questions in American history. How far does the public’s right to know extend? What information should be kept secret in order to protect national security? Who has the right to decide these issues? Ultimately, FRUS represents an ongoing conversation about how much
information should be withheld from the nation’s citizens in order to advance foreign policy objectives carried out in the name of the people. Although the history of FRUS provides no permanent answers, the series serves as an important vehicle for continuing the dialogue. This article has focused primarily on how we are doing the work. We invite readers to peruse what we have learned at http://history.state.gov/frus150.

William B. McAllister is Special Projects Division Chief, Office of the Historian, United States Department of State, Washington, DC.

ARMY ESTABLISHES A NEW CAREER PROGRAM FOR HISTORIANS AND MUSEUM PERSONNEL: CP 61

By Richard W. Stewart

On 21 April 2011, the Army for the first time officially established a Career Program for Historians, Museum, and Archival Personnel: CP 61. This was part of a much larger Civilian Workforce Transformation process started by Army Personnel (G-1). For many years the Army historical community has had a Career Field (CF) 61 for Historians (0170); Museum curators (1015), Exhibit Specialists (1010), and Museum Technicians/Specialists (1016). But with fewer than 400 members of all those specialties in the Army, the Army personnel community had considered us too small to warrant a full Career Program. However, last year the Army senior leadership directed the G-1 to place all Army civilians into a Career Program if there was a natural fit, and if one did not already exist that was a good match for a particular specialty, to create one. As a result of this decision, CP 61 was created for all historians and museum career professionals. After some additional negotiating, the CP was expanded in January of this year to include Archive Technicians (1421) and Archivists (1420) for a total of around 438 individuals in the Program.

The benefits of such a move to a full Career Program for Army historians, museum, and archival personnel are many, but especially because it will allow us access to the full range of funded professional development opportunities that other career programs have had for years. We can now compete for functional professional development money to send our people to civilian schools on a selective basis to take courses and even obtain degrees in our professions. It will open up the entire realm of funded training opportunities beyond those for strictly Army leadership, supervisory, or management training.

CP 61 will be a centrally funded and centrally guided program that will establish professional standards and career maps for historians, museum, and archival personnel across the Army. It will establish the basic criteria for recruiting the highest quality personnel (subject to OPM rules and regulations of course), providing them access to the full range of professional development opportunities (funded courses and schooling, civilian education system courses, research fellowships, a career intern program, developmental assignments, etc.) that will allow us to retain and grow them through the course of a career of ever-increasing professional opportunities from GS-04 up to SES. It will make vacancies in the history, museum, and archival communities more transparent. It will provide more visibility for professional development opportunities along with competitive access to funding. It will provide a clearer picture of career tracks and career opportunities in accordance with visible and tracked Individual Development Plans (IDPs). And it will set the standards for all members of the community to strive towards.

While it will take awhile to put all of the basic documents and procedures in place, the new Army Career Program 61 holds out the promise of a more rational career system for Army historians; museum curators, exhibit technicians, and museum technicians; and archive technicians and archivists. It will put in place a transparent system for career progression with necessary funding for true professional development. It will change the shape of the historical, museum, and archival professions within the Army for decades to come.

Richard W. Stewart is Chief Historian at the U.S. Army Center of Military History, Washington, DC.

1940 CENSUS NOW ONLINE

The 1940 census was released on April 12, 2012, with free, online access at www.1940Census.Archives.gov. For additional information on the census, including the instructions to the enumerators and the questions that were asked, visit www.archives.gov/research/census/1940/general-info.html
Arlington National Cemetery is one of America’s most important shrines. One of many national military cemeteries, it is one of two administered by the United States Army. All of the others are operated by the Department of Veterans Affairs. With a panoramic view of the nation’s capital, Arlington National Cemetery is the most visible of the national cemeteries. It gained a special place in the nation’s heart with installation of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in 1921. To later generations, it became associated with the wrenching national trauma of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, whose eternal flame glows day and night.

Even Arlington National Cemetery, however, is subject to change. Section 60, located in the eastern part of the cemetery, contains a great number of the fatalities of the current conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. As such, this part of Arlington has become a sobering shrine that vividly illustrates the true cost of the ongoing War on Terror.

Area 60 illustrates a shift in cultural norms. Societies grieve differently with the passage of time. The phenomenon of leaving personal items, sometimes in designed arrangements, became prevalent almost immediately at the Vietnam War Memorial, which opened in 1982. In response, the National Park Service began a program of collecting some of the items that were left. The phenomenon repeated itself at the Murrah Building in Oklahoma City, which was destroyed by a bomb in 1995, and the World Trade Center in New York, destroyed in the attacks of September 11, 2001.

Initially, Arlington National Cemetery was exempt from this cultural shift. Traditionally, only flowers or wreaths were left on graves. However, several years ago Section 60 began to be festooned with military objects such as challenge coins, medals and patches; personal items such as photographs and letters; beads, Hawaiian leis, flasks, bottles of beer or spirits, and boxes of cigars.

Like its civilian counterparts in Oklahoma City and Ground Zero, the Army recognized a new phenomenon and reviewed its policy. In 2009, the U.S. Army Center of Military History undertook a pilot project to document items left behind. A team of Army museum curators make regular collecting trips to the cemetery—but only to Section 60, and only to the graves of fatalities of Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. Before moving any items, the museum curators first make a pictorial record of the arrangement of items left on graves. At the discretion of the curator, select items are then placed in museum-quality bags. Each bag carries a tag which contains basic information such as the date and grave name and number. The items gathered are then entered into a simple database, and then afterward placed into numbered boxes and stored. Thousands of artifacts have been thus identified and gathered.

The items gathered include flags, t-shirts, unit crests, shot glasses, wedding bands, football tickets, cards, letters, photographs, report cards, ultrasound images of fetuses, hotel room keys, and even a football helmet. For the curators, gathering things at Area 60 can be a very solemn, even heart-wrenching activity. The mementos often offer a close view into the personal lives of fallen service men and women of the current conflicts. The tragedy of lives cut short is all too apparent when reviewing these artifacts.

Many of the things left reflect the season. For example, in late October Halloween decorations cover the graves, a process that continues for all the major holidays. Items left for holidays such as Christmas or July Fourth are never removed until the appropriate date has passed. Likewise, birthday cards and presents are not removed until after that date has passed.

The pilot project has been the subject of numerous newspaper articles, including one on the front page of the Washington Post on Veterans Day, 2011, and features appeared on the NBC, Fox, and CNN networks. Many relatives of the deceased have expressed approval of the project. One family requested that a grave be left untouched—a wish that has been respected. The entire project is still very much in the pilot phase, but the items gathered are undoubtedly a stark reminder of the cost of freedom and the true price of war.

Roderick Gainer is a curator at the U.S. Army Center of Military History, Washington, DC.
On December 3, 1861, even as the Civil War compromised prospects for the very survival of the American political experiment, President Abraham Lincoln and Secretary of State William Seward released several hundred pages of diplomatic correspondence. This evolutionary step appalled some and fascinated many. It also laid roots that have endured, in the form of the Department of State’s Office of the Historian.

Today, the Office of the Historian (HO) produces the Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS) series and also, through the efforts of the Special Projects and Policy Studies Divisions, provides policy-supportive historical studies and undertakes a variety of historical outreach efforts in support of the mission of the Department of State and the Bureau of Public Affairs. All departmental historians help advance the Office’s commitment toward informing and educating both policy makers and the American public.

FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES SERIES

The most visible and enduring project undertaken by the Office of the Historian is the FRUS series. Begun in 1861 and encompassing more than 480 volumes, FRUS is the largest and most comprehensive series of edited diplomatic documents in the world. Since 1991, HO has produced the series under a congressional mandate calling for the timely publication of volumes providing “thorough, accurate, and reliable” coverage of major foreign policy decisions and significant diplomatic activities of the United States. The same 1991 statute also provides HO historians with unparalleled access to records from across the federal government for possible inclusion in FRUS. This allows the series to incorporate a broader scope of records than ever before.

Producing the series requires a combination of specialized expertise, scholarly rigor, and extensive coordination both within the Office and among the Office and other federal agencies. Approximately 30 of the 50 historians employed by the Office, which constitutes the world’s largest concentration of historians specializing in U.S. diplomatic history, are engaged in the research, compilation, review, declassification, and publication of FRUS volumes. The preparation of each volume poses unique challenges related to the availability of relevant sources, the need to compress more source material into less space, and the balancing of comprehensiveness and timeliness. The uniform parade of FRUS’s ruby-red buckram addresses the need for cohesiveness for the series as a whole, but each individual volume embodies a different set of opportunities seized and obstacles overcome.

To commemorate the 150th anniversary of the series, the Office has launched special research and outreach initiatives to investigate the history of FRUS and share that story with a variety of audiences. We have learned more about the series’ past accomplishments, present challenges, and future potential. Department of State historians during the 1930s, for example, felt squeezed by conflicting pressures from the academic community and Congress to publish volumes early and from U.S. diplomats and foreign governments to withhold more information from public release. The sesquicentennial research effort has also illuminated the difficulties encountered in accelerating the pace of production or redefining the goals of the series—even those initiated by the White House or Congress. Finally, HO has gained a textured understanding of the many ways that government, media, academic, and public consumers have used the series.

Despite recent challenges, the Office of the Historian and the Foreign Relations series have regained momentum in the last few years. Although the Office published only three FRUS volumes in 2009, it released six volumes in 2010 and seven in 2011. This year may see FRUS match the largest number of volumes ever published. Research for the Carter administration volumes will be completed during this calendar year, and focus will shift emphatically towards the Reagan years. The Office is also preparing volumes formatted for e-readers to complement print and online releases.
The Office of the Historian is staffed by professional historians who are experts in the history of U.S. foreign policy and the Department of State and possess unparalleled research experience in classified and unclassified government records.

The Office of the Historian is responsible, under law, for the preparation and publication of the official documentary history of U.S. foreign policy in the Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS) series. The Office also prepares policy-supportive historical studies for Department principals and other agencies and conducts an array of initiatives, ranging from briefing memos to multiyear research projects. The Office of the Historian promotes the declassification of documents to ensure a complete and accurate understanding of the past.

The Office’s public outreach activities include hosting scholarly conferences, answering historical research questions, consulting with scholars, educators, and students, and working with high school teachers across the country to provide high-quality curriculum materials.
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Our outreach programs have constituted an area of growth for the Office. A brief video and curriculum guide on terrorism, released in 2002, was one of the most widely used post-9/11 curriculum packages in the United States. Building upon this success, the Office worked with a select group of social studies educators to produce videos on the history of diplomacy, sport and diplomacy, media, U.S-China relations, and the environment. All five videos were released at the annual meetings of the National Council for the Social Studies. The Office’s latest project includes a curriculum package consisting of important primary source foreign policy documents accompanied by targeted lessons and other teaching tools. Department historians frequently highlight the programmatic aspects of the Office’s work at various conferences and symposia.
The Office of the Historian benefits from an increasingly intimate relationship with the Department of State in general and with the Bureau of Public Affairs in particular. FRUS is the flagship operation and has benefitted greatly from wise counsel from the statutory Historical Advisory Committee. In addition, by moving aggressively to provide relevant guidance drawn from the country’s rich, and often controversial, diplomatic experience, the Special Projects Division and the Policy Studies Division have convinced the Department of State of the wisdom of broadening the Office’s resource base. A sense of team effort underpins the work of all components of the Office even with a staff almost twice as large as it was three years ago. For the first time billets are completely filled, and the Office works under constrained space conditions. A new scheduled move to more capacious headquarters promises to address this situation, once the Office addresses the attendant daunting logistical challenges. The Office will continue to provide an accurate and timely telling of American diplomatic adventures, serving a vital function in the articulation of American foreign policy.

Ambassador Edward Brynn is Acting Historian of the U.S. Department of State. He wishes to thank Joshua Botts, Amy Garrett, William McAllister, and Kristin Ahlberg for their helpful comments and suggestions.

The February 2012 issue of Perspectives on History is now available online. What does the digital age mean for history? AHA President William Cronon expresses his support for Wikipedia, and AHA Executive Director James Grossman examines what the future holds for the AHA. Also in the issue: news of the American Historical Review’s new prize for the best digital article, a retrospective look at the 126th annual meeting, using sports to teach history, and much more.

New American Historical Review Prize for the Best Digital Article: The American Historical Review invites submissions of online works of digital historical scholarship to be considered for the newly established AHR Prize in Digital Historical Scholarship. The winning submission will be published online by Oxford University Press in April 2014 as a fully peer-reviewed, fully citable work of original scholarship and as an integral part of the AHR. The deadline for submission is March 1, 2013. Learn more in this announcement and call for submissions from the February 2012 issue of Perspectives on History.

U.S. Army Center of Military History

The Center recently published Freedom by the Sword: The U.S. Colored Troops, 1862-1867. Written by William A. Dobak, the book explores how, during the Civil War, the federal government accepted more than 180,000 African American men to serve in the United States Army. Known collectively as the United States Colored Troops and organized into segregated regiments led by white officers, some of these black soldiers guarded army posts; others fought Confederate raiders to protect Union supply trains; and still others took part in major operations like the siege of Petersburg and the battle of Nashville. After the war, many black regiments garrisoned the former Confederacy to enforce federal Reconstruction policy. Freedom by the Sword tells not only the story of how these black units were recruited and organized, it also book examines what black soldiers contributed to the Union

SHFG’s E-BULLETIN
Send announcements to shfg.ebulletin@gmail.com
The bulletin is a service to SHFG members.
victory. In 2012 the Organization of American Historians awarded the book’s author, Dr. William Dobak, the Richard W. Leopold prize for the best book on foreign policy, military affairs, or the historical activities of the federal government by a government historian.

In 2011 the center also published John Sloan Brown’s *Kevlar Legions: The Transformation of the U.S. Army 1989–2005*. The book is the story of how the United States Army responded to the challenges of the end of the Cold War by transforming itself into the most capable ground force in the world today. It argues that from 1989 through 2005 the U.S. Army attempted, and largely achieved, a centrally directed and institutionally driven transformation relevant to ground warfare that exploited Information Age technology, adapted to post-Cold War strategic circumstances, and integrated those initiatives into parallel Department of Defense efforts. The process not only modernized equipment, it also substantially altered doctrine, organization, training, administrative and logistical practices, and the service culture. *Kevlar Legions* further contends that the digitized expeditionary army has withstood the test of combat, performing superbly with respect to deployment and high-end conventional combat and capably with respect to low-intensity conflict and the counterinsurgency challenges of Iraq and Afghanistan.

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers**

At a February 2012 ceremony at the Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Office of History unveiled its latest publication entitled *Situation Desperate: U.S. Army Engineer Disaster Relief Operations, Origins to 1950*. The richly illustrated history, which was literally decades in the making, was written by Dr. Leland Johnson. The book examines the history of the Army Engineer disaster assistance mission and traces the evolution of the federal program from its tentative beginnings in the 19th century to the enactment of a permanent federal policy on disaster assistance in 1950. It explains how the Army Engineers came to acquire that mission during the great Mississippi River flood of 1882, describes the development of the Corps’ statutory authorities and the Army’s regulations for emergency operations, and tells the stories of Corps and Army Engineer operations during various natural and man made disasters.

**FEDERAL RESERVE BANK**

Over the past few years, the Research Division of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis has been quietly assembling a vast array of historical and economic documents in digital form on its FRASER web site (fraser.stlouisfed.org). The Federal Reserve Archival System for Economic Research is a project of the Center for Economic Documents Digitization at the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. “The Center seeks to preserve and provide access to the nation’s economic history through digitization of original documents.”

At first focusing on providing economic data to the public, FRASER has expanded its scope over time to provide thousands of documents pertaining to the history of the Federal Reserve System. Among the many annual reports contained on the web site are copies of all the annual reports from the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. Of course, there is a focus on the Federal Reserve System with documents touching on all facets of its history. Sources include Congressional hearings, reports by various organizations, books, Federal Reserve publications, statements and speeches of Fed policymakers, and the papers of Federal Reserve leaders.

**HISTORY ASSOCIATES INCORPORATED**

History Associates Incorporated has been hired by the National Park Service (NPS) to conduct a historic resource study for the George Washington Carver National Monument in Diamond, Missouri. Once completed, the study will be used to enhance the creation of future exhibits, tours, and other interpretive programs. It will be a valuable resource for park managers, interpretive planners, cultural resource specialists, as well as the interested public. History Associates will also assess the historic district encompassing the park to determine if additional properties beyond the Park are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

The project team, including Dr. Jason H. Gart and W. David Wiseman, Jr., will research an extensive list of primary and secondary sources for the study, supplementing material in the park’s museum collection with internal NPS historical studies, as well as key collections at the Library of Congress, Tuskegee University, the National Archives, the Missouri State Historical Society, and others.

History Associates celebrated the grand opening of the National Museum of Organized Crime and Law Enforcement—“The Mob Museum”—in Las Vegas on February 14, 2012. History Associates was part of the museum’s development and creative team, advising on content and assisting in locating historic images. The new museum resides in the former United States Post Office and Federal Courthouse building in downtown Las Vegas. The historic building has special significance, as it hosted the Kefauver Committee hearings, which were held to investigate the world of organized crime in the early 1950s. The actual courtroom is still there and was restored to look as it did during the hearings. For more information about History Associates, call (301) 279-9697 or visit www.historyassociates.com.
**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**“Due to the Circumstances of Today”: The U.S. House of Representatives Remembers September 11, 2001**


As part of its ongoing oral history program, the Office of the Historian, U.S. House of Representatives, unveiled a new project commemorating the 10th anniversary of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. This event-based oral history compilation features eyewitness accounts from former Representatives, House officials, and employees about 9/11 and the day’s subsequent effects on the institution. “Due to the Circumstances of Today”—the quotation used in the title of this project—was the language inserted into the *Congressional Record* to explain the emergency recess on the morning of September 11th.

Divided into four broad themes—September 11, 2001, Reaction and Response, Security and Safety, and In Retrospect—the web site includes video and audio clips of interviewees reflecting on their personal experiences of that tragic day and the weeks and months that followed.

Also included on the web site is a compilation video, “September 11, 2001: A Narrative,” of unique perspectives from the House on 9/11, a series of images and artifacts related to the history of the House and the attacks, a timeline of the day’s events, and a contribution form for those who worked at the House on 9/11 and would like to share their experiences.

For questions or more information, please contact: Office of the Historian, U.S. House of Representatives, B-56 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515. Tel: 202-226-5525; Fax: 202-226-2931; E-mail: history@mail.house.gov

**NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION**

Both the *Titanic* and *Lusitania* will be featured in the National Archives at New York City’s exhibit “The World’s Port: The Port of New York.” Opening in September 2012 at the new location of the National Archives at New York City at the Alexander Hamilton U.S. Custom House at One Bowling Green, the exhibit explore immigration, commerce, crime, and disaster in and around the Port of New York.


The John F. Kennedy Library released the final 45 hours of secret recordings the president made during his time in office in the days leading up to his assassination. The recordings are part of a larger collection of 248 hours of taped meetings and 12 hours of phone conversations that have been reviewed and released by the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum since 1993. They include private meetings, telephone calls, and discussions about such critical issues as the upcoming 1964 election, U.S.-Soviet relations, the Vietnam War, Soviet relations, and the space race. The Presidential Recordings Program at the University of Virginia has published three volumes of transcripts and is working on another two of previously released tapes.

The National Archives at Atlanta released online the papers of Dr. John C. Cutler. Dr. Cutler, a former employee of the U.S. Public Health Service, 1942–1967, was involved in research on Guatemalan soldiers, prisoners, and mental health patients who were exposed to the syphilis bacteria. The collection is available online [http://www.archives.gov/research/health/cdc-cutler-records] and at the National Archives at Atlanta, located at 5780 Jonesboro Road, Morrow, Georgia, 30260. This collection which consists of approximately 12,000 pages of correspondence, reports, photographs, and patient records was donated in September of 1990 to the University of Pittsburgh by Dr. Cutler. In September 2010, the University contacted the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to request the transfer of the material to the federal government. After examining the material, it was determined that they were federal records and they were transferred to the National Archives at Atlanta in October, 2010.

**TREASURY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION**

The Treasury Historical Association (THA) had its annual meeting last December 7. The featured speaker was former Secretary of the Treasury Paul H. O’Neill. Secretary O’Neill reminisced about his two-year term at the Treasury during the George W. Bush administration. He shared with the audience a number of points, including his views on proposed tax cuts during the Bush years, his reforms in Treasury administration, and his missions to Africa to improve living conditions there, one of which was with U2 singer Bono.

Preceding Secretary O’Neill’s talk, the THA leadership provided members with committee reports, including the progress of sales of the Association’s book on the history of the Treasury building, Fortress of Finance. It was also announced that as of the meeting, the THA had contributed over $165,000 to the Treasury towards restoration projects in and around the historic Treasury building. The most recent donation was for a jointly funded project to restore a set of double spiral staircases that were damaged by the installation of a former elevator in 1910. The executive council was also re-elected for another term: Gary Grippo (president), Franklin Noll (vice president), David Monroe (treasurer), Lori Santamorena (secretary), and Thomas O’Malley (chairman of the board).
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